

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
Ray Ballister, Jr., Esq., SBN 111282  
Mark Potter, Esq., SBN 166317  
Phyl Grace, Esq., SBN 171771  
Dennis Price, SBN 279082  
Mail: PO Box 262490  
San Diego, CA 92196-2490  
Delivery: 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300  
San Diego, CA 92131  
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
phylg@potterhandy.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**Daniel Lopez,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**Salisbury Family Limited  
Partnership**, a California Limited  
Partnership;  
**El Cholo, Inc** and Does 1-10,  
Defendants.

**Case No.**

**Complaint For Damages And  
Injunctive Relief For** Violations Of:  
American's With Disabilities Act;  
Unruh Civil Rights Act

Plaintiff Daniel Lopez complains of Defendants Consuelo Duran; Jose Duran; Arturo Duran; Jose Hernandez; and Does 1-10 ("Defendants") and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES:**

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is a paraplegic who cannot walk and who uses a wheelchair for mobility.

2. Defendant Salisbury Family Limited Partnership a California Limited Partnership, owned the property located at or about 1121 Southwestern Ave Los Angeles, CA 90006, California, in May, 2015.

1       3. Defendant Salisbury Family Limited Partnership a California Limited  
2 Partnership, owned the property located at or about 1121 Southwestern Ave Los  
3 Angeles, CA 90006, California, currently.

4       4. Defendant El Cholo, Inc owned the El Cholo Restaurant ("El Cholo") located  
5 at or about 1121 Southwestern Ave Los Angeles, CA 90006, California, in May  
6 2015.

7       5. Defendant El Cholo, Inc owned the El Cholo Restaurant ("El Cholo") located  
8 at or about 1121 Southwestern Ave Los Angeles, CA 90006, California, currently.

9       6. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business  
10 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative  
11 responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a  
12 joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed  
13 and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10,  
14 inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a  
15 necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend  
16 when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the  
17 Defendants and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

18  
19       **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

20       7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28  
21 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with  
22 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

23       8. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause of  
24 action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the same  
25 transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, which act  
26 expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

27       9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is founded  
28 on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is located in this

1 district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

2  
3 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

4 10. The Plaintiff went to El Chollo in May 2015 to eat.

5 11. El Chollo is a facility open to the public, a place of public accommodation,  
6 and a business establishment.

7 12. Restrooms are one of the facilities, privileges and advantages specifically for  
8 patrons of El Chollo.

9 13. In May 2015, the toilet stall was improperly configured and too small for  
10 wheelchair users, measuring 44 inches in width and 100 inches in depth.

11 14. In May 2015, the restroom had a cabinet style sink that did not provide any  
12 knee clearance for wheelchair users.

13 15. In May 2015, the restroom did not provide for a 60 inch diameter turning  
14 radius.

15 16. Currently, the toilet stall was improperly configured and too small for  
16 wheelchair users, measuring 44 inches in width and 100 inches in depth.

17 17. Currently, the restroom does not provide for a 60 inch diameter turning  
18 radius.

19 18. Currently, the restroom was improperly configured and too small for  
20 wheelchair users, measuring less than 60 inches wide by 59 inches deep.

21 19. Plaintiff would like to return to and patronize El Chollo but will be deterred  
22 from visiting until the defendants cure the violations.

23 20. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable conditions  
24 those features required to provide ready access to persons with disabilities.

25 21. The violations identified above are easily removed without much difficulty or  
26 expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the Department of Justice as  
27 presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact, these barriers are readily  
28 achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous alternative accommodations

1 that could be made to provide a greater level of access if complete removal were not  
2 achievable.

3 22. Given the obvious and blatant violation, the plaintiff alleges, on information  
4 and belief, that there are other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his  
5 disability. Plaintiff will amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the  
6 scope of this lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on  
7 notice that the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied.  
8 See *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff  
9 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his  
10 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

11 23. Plaintiff is and has been deterred from returning and patronizing El Chollo  
12 because of his knowledge of the illegal barriers that exist. Plaintiff will, nonetheless,  
13 return to El Chollo to assess ongoing compliance with the ADA and will return to  
14 patronize El Chollo as a customer once the barriers are removed.

15 24. Additionally, on information and belief, the plaintiff alleges that the failure  
16 to remove these barriers was intentional because: (1) these particular barriers are  
17 intuitive and obvious; (2) the defendants exercised control and dominion over the  
18 conditions at this location and, therefore, the lack of accessible facilities was not an  
19 “accident” because had the defendants intended any other configuration, they had  
20 the means and ability to make the change.

21  
22 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH**  
23 **DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of plaintiffs and against all defendants  
24 (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

25 25. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again  
26 herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

27 26. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the  
28 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place

1 of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns,  
 2 leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).  
 3 Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- 4 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or  
 5 procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods,  
 6 services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to  
 7 individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a  
 8 fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. §  
 9 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 10 b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is  
 11 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined  
 12 by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36, Appendix  
 13 “D.”
- 14 c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum  
 15 extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily  
 16 accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including  
 17 individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum  
 18 extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the  
 19 bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered  
 20 area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with  
 21 disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

22 27. Where a toilet stall is provided in a restroom in existing facilities, the size and  
 23 arrangement of the standard toilet stall shall comply with either Fig. 30(a) (standard  
 24 stall) or Figure 30(b) (alternate stall). 1991 Standards § 4.17.3. A standard stall  
 25 must be at least 60 inches wide by 56 inches deep (if the toilet is wall mounted) or  
 26 59 inches deep if the toilet is floor mounted. 1991 Standards § Figure 30(a). An  
 27 alternate stall must meet one of two configurations: either (1) be exactly 36 inches  
 28 by at least 66 inches deep (if the toilet is wall mounted) or 69 inches (if the toilet is

1 floor mounted) and provide front transfer grab bars or (2) be at least 48 inches wide  
 2 by at least by at least 66 inches deep (if the toilet is wall mounted) or 69 inches (if  
 3 the toilet is floor mounted) and provide side transfer grab bars. 1991 Standards §  
 4 Figure 30(b).

5 28. Here, the toilet stall does not meet any option under the ADA and is in  
 6 violation of the law.

7 29. Sinks must provide knee clearance of at least 29 inches in height. 1991  
 8 Standards § 4.19.2 and Figure 31; 2010 Standards § 606.2 and 306.

9 30. Here, no such knee clearance was provided and this is a violation of the ADA.

10 31. In order for a bathroom to be considered accessible, it must provide  
 11 unobstructed 60 inches in diameter of turning space. 1991 Standards § 4.23.3;  
 12 4.2.3; 2010 Standards § 603.2.1; 304.3.1.

13 32. Here, there is no such turning radius and the restroom is not accessible.

14 33. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition those  
 15 features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to  
 16 and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

17 34. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available and  
 18 ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

19 35. Given El Chollo's location, roughly 10 miles from his home, and their menu,  
 20 which Plaintiff enjoys, Plaintiff will continue to desire to patronize the El Chollo,  
 21 but he has been, and will continue to be, discriminated against due to the lack of  
 22 accessible facilities and, therefore, seeks injunctive relief to remove these barriers  
 23 that violate the ADA and his right to full and equal access.

24  
 25 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**  
 26 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of plaintiff and against all defendants) (Cal Civ § 51-53)

27 36. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again  
 28 herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

1 37. Because the defendants violated the plaintiffs' rights under the ADA, they  
2 also violated the Unruh Civil Rights Act and are liable for damages. (Civ. Code §  
3 51(f), 52(a).)

4 38. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,  
5 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each  
6 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-(c).)

7  
8 **PRAYER:**

9 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief  
10 as follows:


11 1. For injunctive relief, compelling defendants to comply with the Americans  
12 with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the Plaintiff is not  
13 invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief  
14 under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

15 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act which damages provide for actual  
16 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000.

17 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to  
18 42 U.S.C. § 12205; Cal. Civ. Code § 52.

19  
20  
21 Dated: April 18, 2016

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

22   
23 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
24 Mark Potter, Esq.  
25 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
26  
27  
28